Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*
Combined with the Magazine ANALYSIS
Editorial Office 1100 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066
VOL. VII, NO. 391 *Issue Number* 391, JULY 25, 1951 ★ *Editor:* FRANK C. HANIGHEN ★ *Associate Editor:* FRANK CHODOROV

RECEIVED JUL 31 '51 CLEVELAND LIBRARY

WILL SPAIN FIGHT?

By Franz Borkenau

As a military agreement between the U.S. and Spain is reportedly under negotiation, we offer an analysis of the advantages as well as the pitfalls of such a deal -- written just before the late Admiral Sherman went to Madrid. The author has a long knowledge of Spain and, in our opinion, wrote the best book on the Spanish Civil War, The Spanish Cockpit, (1937).

The West, girding its loins for the impending struggle with Communism, is confronted with a problem that bothered the Great Alliance against Louis XIV of France in 1700: Will Spain Fight? The consensus of opinion at that time is summarized by the British historian G. M. Trevelyan in these words:

"Spain no longer weighed in the balance of power as at the time of the Armada. There was little use in warships that could never put to sea, or in regiments that could never take the field. But great use could be made of the harbors, fortresses, territories and populations belonging to Spain."

That is still true. Few things Spanish have substantially changed in the last 250 years. That fact must be taken into account in evaluating Spain's possible contribution to a struggle against Communism. Politically, Spain has undergone mutations -- as what country has not? -- but the traditions of her people have held firm, and her geographical position is unchanged. She is still the Spain that had to be reckoned with in the struggle to stop the French urge toward world domination two and a half centuries ago.

Her unique geographical position is now, as then, most indispensable. Spain holds:

1. The key to the Mediterranean, on which access to Southern Europe and the Near East depends;

2. The key to North Africa, and consequently to Dakar;

3. A strong flanking position in the Atlantic, important for submarine warfare, and

4. The best and nearest base for retreat from and advance into Western Europe.

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Because of her unique peninsular and mountainous character, Spain can be held by a small force, at comparatively little cost. She is a natural air-base; she can harbor naval forces under ideal conditions. Her "harbors, fortresses and territories" are still her greatest assets.

II

But, and this should not be forgotten, she cannot supply "warships that can never put to sea and regiments that cannot take the field". Not since the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648) has any considerable body of Spanish troops served successfully outside their own country. The Spaniard has always been a good fighter and a poor soldier; he has courage but lacks the capacity for discipline.

Were Russian troops to approach a Spanish town, every man, woman and child would fight them to the death. But, Spanish divisions on the Rhine would vanish into thin air at the first approach of danger. Used in the Pyrenees, their usefulness will be somewhere between these two extremes, while in the defense of their own country, on their native land, they would fight with the same valor, and present the same problems, as did the South Koreans. And this would be so regardless of the kind of government in control.

Because of her geographical position, it is absolutely essential that Spain become part of the defensive alliance against the Russian threat. But, because of her inability to deliver anything in the way of a strong striking force, the West ought not to bargain for it. It is silly to pay a price for something which her political and economic structure is unable to deliver, and to which the psychology of her people is very strongly opposed.

General Franco, who successfully cheated Hitler and resisted pressure from the West, has shown himself to be a shrewd bargainer. He has threatened us with neutralism, with withholding the geographical assets that Spain can deliver. At the same time, he has offered Spanish troops abroad, which, if he could produce, would be of questionable value.

The price he asks is the support of his regime. It is not an unreasonable price -- for what we need, but not for what he offers. It is true that Spain would not go communistic immediately should he disappear from the scene. The Spanish people have not forgotten their experience with Communism; they met and overthrew the terroristic rule of the NKVD in March, 1939, even before Franco's victory. They are not likely to welcome the Soviets, if Franco were to be eliminated. Nevertheless, the overthrow of Franco now would be disastrous in the course of time.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

III

Spain's political history is dotted with "bad" regimes that have been strong, while most of her "good" regimes have been weak. The basic cause for this phenomenon is the profound hostility toward government in general on the part of the Spanish people. The dictatorship of Primo de Rivera in the twenties was much more lenient than Franco's (which, by the way, is presently not more oppressive than any other non-democratic regime, and infinitely less oppressive than Stalin's); and the moderate republican leadership in 1931 were well-intentioned. Both these regimes fell; neither had popular support. Franco, on the other hand, maintains himself in the midst of the most varied difficulties.

If Franco should fall, he would be succeeded by some combination of liberal monarchists and moderate republicans, disunited among themselves and constantly under pressure from right and left. The only well-organized force in the country would be the Communists, and we can rest assured that they would exploit the weakness of the regime and eventually attain a key position, despite the general abhorrence of Communism. Then the "harbors, fortresses and territories" might no longer be available to the West, regardless of the formal promises of the regime. We should make it clear to Franco that we shall not favor such political developments.

Franco is therefore a military necessity. But, we should not make a futile attempt to reconstruct the Spanish economy. It would be futile, first of all, because the Spaniards are not likely to repay economic improvement with political allegiance; and, secondly, because nothing much could be done to improve Spain's economy with a short-term program. To drain the veritable sea of Spain's economic misery would call for a long pull and a very large amount of capital.

Hence, the best the West could do for Franco, and the alliance, would be to concentrate on making Spain fit to resist an onslaught. Incidentally, such a program would go a long way to ameliorate her immediate economic condition.

IV

Roads and railroads are Spain's first requirement. The chains of high mountain ranges, all running east and west, are ideal for the defense of Spain, even if the Pyrenees were successfully crossed by an enemy; but these natural barriers are inadequate in modern warfare without a system of transportation. Spain has practically none.

Second priority should go to the construction of air bases and the reconstruction of naval bases. Fortifications could be built in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pyrenees at very little cost. It might be politically inexpedient to set up military bases in Spain. But this is not necessary: technical advisers would be the most important personnel contribution to the effort. To that should be added a system of stringent controls over the proper use of the West's contributions or loans.

It has been suggested that no money should be spent on Spain without first putting an end to the corruption within the Franco regime. If anybody could clean up the political corruption of that country, he would be indeed a great man, greater than any the country has found in centuries. The best the West could do, after making due allowance for traditional Spanish inefficiency, is to see that its funds are not squandered. By limiting our interference to this one point, we would gain respect and prestige, whereas our inevitable failure in any attempt to straighten out the Spanish economy -- or its politics -- would make us look foolish.

Strict surveillance of the funds appropriated for these purposes would do more than gain the good will of those who are thereby employed; it would go a great way toward strengthening Franco's position. Franco might openly object to such surveillance, but secretly he could not but welcome it. For, it would provide him with a source of revenue less subject than the others to the depredations of the Falange, which is the really objectionable element in the Spanish political picture.

Were we to insist on close supervision of our investment in Spain, the Falange, which prospers on the nation's miseries, would do its utmost to prevent our close cooperation with Franco. The Falange will employ every possible method of propaganda and intrigue to wreck the proposed alliance. However, although the interests of the Falange are far from identical with those of Franco, he will, at the proper time, make use of their resistance to drive a hard bargain.

Franco's regime is not "totalitarian". He is not the absolute master of Spain. Independent forces -- church, army, landowners, Falange -- are always at work. The job of winning Spain to the West involves the use of consummate diplomatic skill. We must by skillful negotiation and use of our influence tip the internal balance of these political forces in our favor.

Above all, we must rid ourselves of the illusion that we can have Franco, and Spain, any time we get ready to do business, and at our own price. He is too wily for that. Nor must we fear our losing him for good, because Spain detests Communism and must have the support of the West in the event Stalin marches. It will take a delicate hand to win and hold Spain.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip — *A Supplement to* Human Events — Vol. VIII, No. 30

RECEIVED JUL 51 LIBRARY

By Frank C. Hanighen — July 25, 1951

AROUND THE TOWN: The Taft boom for 1952 has taken on new life. Work on delegates is being pushed with some success by friends of the Ohio Senator. And it is reported, without confirmation, that the powerful Cowles newspaper and magazine chain may support Taft. The conversation of Mr. Gardiner Cowles, who takes a dim view of the Eisenhower army after a trip to Europe, sounds suspiciously pro-Taft to a number of observers.

----- These are the "dog days" of hot mid-summer in the Capital. Perhaps that is the reason why everybody talks of a story, now going the rounds, incredulously, but continues to talk about it with fascination. The tale runs that Col. McCormick is trying to buy the morning Washington Post, Fair Deal organ in Washington; and that he would like to amalgamate it with his morning Washington Times-Herald, thus making the end product the only morning newspaper in the Capital. Few believe that Mr. Eugene Meyer, owner of the Post, would sell. But everyone agrees that, if he should, the results for the Administration would be uncomfortable: The Colonel's anti-Administration views and news would monopolize the morning field, and a number of pro-Administration columnists, now in the Post, would be without a Washington "spot".

----- There is a good deal of humorous discussion about an Administration probe of the so-called "China Lobby". According to one account, Mr. Truman summoned Assistant Attorney General Peyton Ford and asked him to hasten preparations for such an investigation. The President seemed rather startled when the Department of Justice functionary protested that he had been unable so far to discover evidence of the existence of any "China Lobby".

----- Lowell Stockman (R.), Representative in Congress from the 2nd District of Oregon, is being mentioned as a possible successor to Mr. Marriner Eccles, who has just resigned from the Federal Reserve Board.

----- It may be only a result of the heat, but there are actually Capitol cloakroom disputes in which some members of Congress contend that the original cause of the Missouri floods is artificial rain-making in Southwestern states. An atmospheric "chain reaction" was set up which produced excessive rainfall in states farther north -- such is the argument. Hence, the battle of the levees. Those maintaining this view claim that distinguished scientists believe this to be so.

* * * * *

SPANISH AGREEMENT: In his analysis this week on relations with Spain, Mr. Borkenau emphasizes that we must strive to get a good bargain out of any deal we make with Madrid. All observers agree that the reported "agreement in principle" between the late Admiral Sherman and General Franco is a constructive step, and many remark that this is the first genuinely realistic move in our otherwise Alice-in-Wonderland foreign policy. Early news dispatches about the cabinet shuffle in Madrid suggest that the U.S. has won a major point in its bargaining talks with the Spanish Chief of State. Franco, it has been announced, has dropped his long-time Minister of Economy, Señor Suances. This gentleman has been one of the most objectionable figures in the Spanish Government and U.S. military men actively pressed Madrid to get rid of Suances as a quid pro quo in the deal. The reason why they disliked Suances is that he had an exceptional talent for wasting money. His grandiose Institute of National Industry scheme has been a boondoggling affair which sought to create superfluous factories in Spain, apparently just for the purpose of increasing the Minister's own power. If the U.S. is to help Spanish economy, the Defense Department wants no Suances in the picture.

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We learned about Suances during our trip to Spain in 1949, and actually had a talk with him. We noted three things about the gentleman: (1) He underscored the need for the State to step in and build factories and run them "when capital is timid". This was accompanied by protestations that he was not against free enterprise. We have heard that line before -- right here in Washington. (2) Next we were informed by Madrid observers that Suances in his early days had been the proprietor of a small business which had gone bankrupt. That, too, sounds familiar. (3) Finally, he had been a school boy class-mate of General Franco and there was an old friendship between the two. Well, the news now indicates that Franco is one Chief of State who can fire a crony.

* * * * *

SEE-SAW: Postmaster Donaldson has been badgering the Congress for higher postal rates, the badgering consisting mainly in a deliberately planned deterioration of the postal service. If the bill now before the House Post Office Committee becomes law, the poorer postal service will cost the taxpayer an additional $123 millions next year. Will that increase reduce the department's deficit, as claimed? Not a bit of it; for the bill also includes an authorization to boost the pay of post office employees by somewhere between $150 and $170 millions. Thus, despite the increased revenues, the deficit will be larger -- and we can be sure the service will not be better. The U.S. Post Office is a socialistic enterprise.

* * * * *

TAX DODGING: Alexander Hamilton pointed out, in the Federalist, that an income tax would hardly yield enough revenue for the proposed Federal government to offset the unpleasantness of collection. Too much business was being conducted in those days on a barter system, and levying on a barter is simply impossible. Now that taxation has become a national menace, it is a certainty, human nature being what it is, that barter will be resorted to whenever possible, and American ingenuity will figure out how to make impossible deals possible.

The farmer's wife pays no sales tax on the cookies brought in by the neighbor, who goes away with an untaxed jar of jelly. The general-store owner can see the advantage of taking a tax-free side of beef in return for some clothes, also untaxed. Arrangements between employers and employees whereby the latter take some of their wages "in kind" -- so as to evade income taxation -- present a continuing problem for the Internal Revenue Bureau agents.

We learn from the Wall Street Journal how the old David Harum business is coming into its own, thanks to the capital gains tax. This is the trading of real estate -- a farm for an apartment house, a coal yard for a store building. The business is being encouraged by a group of some 100 brokers in Chicago, who meet weekly to arrange swaps. No doubt some difficulty is encountered in the adjustment of values; but we trust Yankee know-how to overcome that trifle.

In the long run, the menace of taxation may turn out to be a blessing. In aiming to escape the "publican" (as the Bible calls the despised tax-collector), Americans may re-learn the human art of "visiting".

* * * * *

SECURITY: The national passion for security has been given a novel turn by the International Garment Workers Union. To provide a "nest egg" for workers who lose their jobs because their employers have gone bankrupt, the demand has been made on manufacturers that they tax themselves two per cent of payroll. Of course, if the demand is granted, the percentage will be added to the cost of doing business and the prices will be upped accordingly; the consumer, as always, would carry the burden -- unless he decides to go nude.

The thought occurs: If the consumer becomes stubborn about it and refuses to pay the increased price, will not the union have a precedent for asking for a law to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

compel them to provide the "nest egg" through taxation?

Security -- ain't it wonderful?

* * * * *

COUNTRY CLERGY: A highly interesting and very wholesome rural newsletter, Country Almanac, lays stress in its current issue on the hostile attitude of many rural clergymen toward free enterprise. It says: "These country preachers seem to have it in for businessmen, the well-to-do, so called free enterprise, and even for the advocates of lower taxes. This notwithstanding that they and their churches are largely supported by those members of the community who have been successful enough as businessmen or workers to acquire some economic surplus.

"Frankly, there is nothing that more nearly nauseates us than to have some little fanatic of a country preacher glibly rationalize that Caesarian concept, the charity state, (including the tightly regimented economy that goes with it) out of the teachings of Christ. If Christ's career and preaching had any political and economic implications at all, it was from first to last a bitter attack on the autocratic Roman regime. An attack powerful enough to overthrow it in the end. If there was ever in all history a valiant fighter against despotism, a champion of individual liberty, a teacher of truly democratic ideals, surely it was that Nazarene carpenter."

Country Almanac should meet Faith and Freedom, and it would doubtless rejoice to find another sort of clergyman. The latter publication is the organ of Spiritual Mobilization, a religious organization devoted to the fortifying of the American tradition through religion.

* * * * *

GUTS FOR DEFENSE: The importance of guts for the defense of the nation is well recognized. But, what kind of guts? In the appendix to our National Defense Act, Title 32A, the answer is given: green sheep guts. It is there stated, in precise legal language, that the country is suffering from a shortage of green sheep intestines, the raw material for the manufacture of surgical sutures and musical strings. In ordinary times, the document explains, only the first nine yards of these intestines are used for such products, but the shortage makes it necessary to use the next four and one-half yards. However, the slaughterers have been selling this additional yardage to sausage makers at a ceiling price higher than that prescribed for sutures. To correct the situation -- that is, to assure the country of an adequate supply of sutures -- it is now decreed (under the General Ceiling Price Regulations) that the permissible price for the first nine yards shall be comparable to the next four and one-half yards. The country is saved!

Our friend, Colonel Percy Black, was so inspired by this extraordinary victory that he was moved to pen the following paean:

Green sheep intestines
Are used for many things,
To furnish weiner covers
And repair the guts of kings.

The length of these intestines
Is measured by the yard:
The first nine yards are easy,
But the last four yards come hard.

This fact has caused a crisis
In the national emergency,
Of which Price Stabilization
Has recognized the urgency.

By edict quite official
It has rectified the wrong
That paralyzes surgery
For lack of vital thong.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Events

Undermining the Constitution, by Thomas James Norton. New York: The Devin Adair Co. $3.00. Reviewed by Edna Lonigan.

"Never take your country -- or your college -- for granted", said Alice Duer Miller to her fellow alumnae, "because men have broken their hearts to get it for you".

Mr. Norton sees in every phrase of the Constitution the picture of the men who broke their hearts defying kings and servile judges, prison and death, to get us habeas corpus and our other rights. In his earlier book, The Constitution of the United States: Its Sources and Application, he described what barriers the Constitution-makers erected to protect the people of the Nation against the evils of power, as embodied in government. In this new book he describes how a free people, like the Americans, long accustomed to these barriers against power, could tear down their own protections, one by one, until they are confronted by power almost as free from restraint as that of any tyranny or dictatorship.

As Solomon said, it is the little foxes that eat up the vines. No one could have made political progress in this country by proposing to tear down the Constitution. The "reformers" suggested instead a series of "improvements", and each "improvement" weakened the supporting structures of the whole.

Mr. Norton knows well that the destruction did not begin with the New Deal. There was nothing new about the New Deal. Roosevelt knew where the cracks were, and he struck there. The first serious breach in the Constitutional wall Mr. Norton finds in the attempt by the people of the States, beginning with South Dakota in 1893, to substitute the "initiative", or law-making by the populace, for law-making by an elected representative legislature. This was a direct and total challenge to representative government.

The next attack was by Congress against the courts. Norton holds that attempts by Congress to alter judicial procedures are without validity, as the Constitution gave Congress only the power to make administrative changes in the courts. Such a judicial change is the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which limits the power of injunction, a power which the Courts derive not from Congress but from the Constitution.

In this connection, it is of interest that the Courts had in 1930 granted an injunction to the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, to prevent the Texas and New Orleans Railway from intimidating union members or coercing them to join a company union! The Court even settled contempt proceedings brought by the union, by compelling the railroad to reinstate workers they had discharged on the union issue.

A third attack on the Constitution was the Income Tax Amendment of 1913. Congress had the power to tax incomes. The Amendment was needed so that Congress need not equalize the tax between rich and poor states. There is nothing in the amendment about a graduated tax. Therefore, Norton considers that the whole structure of graduated income taxes is unconstitutional. It also had two political results which were destructive of representative government. The politicians gained a vast money power which they were certain sooner or later to learn how to exploit. It also deprived the states of this source of revenue. "The begging states having been to a degree forced to aid in carrying out, as baronies, the objectives of the superior authority from which they now hold their place on earth and to which they render most humble fealty."

The later steps in usurpation are perhaps more familiar to the reader: such as, the child labor amendment, the stretching of interstate commerce clause in the Stockyards case, the rise of government corporations like TVA, the control of farming. Mr. Norton gives the whole story of the breaking down of each Constitutional barrier, a story which can well be reread in the ominous light of the 1950's.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

European Supplement to Human Events Vol. VIII, No. 30

The views expressed in this EUROPEAN SUPPLEMENT *are those of an experienced European observer, and are interesting for that reason, but they do not necessarily reflect the views of HUMAN EVENTS—Editors.*

By BERTRAND DE JOUVENEL Paris — July, 1951

Of Political Warfare: The American nation is passing an extremely severe test in intellectual adaptability, and is displaying a quite amazing capacity for adjustment to an entirely new situation: a chronic state of political warfare. The history of the American Republic is unique in that this great State developed without ever having to cope with a major threat from a major power, and without meeting any significant opposition in the process of territorial expansion which has quadrupled its territory since 1790. Thus it was not a "fact of life" for Americans that one's country must stand amid a bustle of powers in which it can hold its own only by continual diplomatic vigilance and military preparedness. Then, suddenly, the American nation found itself locked in a world-wide struggle. It had to make a mental adjustment.

General ideas previously current are not helpful. It was once widely believed that "warlikeness" was a superannuated tendency in superannuated institutions, such as monarchy and aristocracy. The overthrow of such institutions in Central and Eastern Europe, as an outcome of World War I, made way for Nazism and Stalinism, regimes which have have proved far more aggressive and brutal. It was once held by advanced minds that Imperialism was an outcome of Capitalism. But the great imperialist power of today is that which has thoroughly liquidated Capitalism.

It was once part of the prevailing philosophy of social progress that, as the power of the ruling classes waned or was extinguished, human relations would be mellowed, both within the nation and in its external conduct. It has not proved so.

Thus the American nation finds itself in an unexpected bustle of conflict, arising out of unexpected developments, and has to wage political warfare, which turns out to be doubly a novelty. First, in that it is a new art for Americans; secondly, in that the art itself has been thoroughly improved by the Russian opponent.

We commentators are prone to express horrified admiration of Stalinian cleverness. On second thought, I am not sure that we should be so overwhelmed. Our opponents have the advantage over us in that they are deliberately playing the game of power, with no holds barred, against people who cannot reconcile themselves to the idea that political relations should descend to that level. We are always expecting them to return to the behavior we expect of our neighbors, civilized behavior, ruled by moral principles. It is certainly not necessary, and indeed it would be disastrous, to adopt their mentality; we must fight them with our principles and our weapons, not theirs. But it is highly advisable, in order to foresee their moves, to attempt a penetration of their mental processes. It is a helpful exercise. Therefore, let us suppose that we have somehow slipped into a secret meeting of an inner circle of Cominform workers and that we can listen to the briefing they receive. Pray read the following as my imaginary rendition of such a speech:

An Imaginary Cominform Agent Speaks: Dear Comrades, once more we have seized the offensive in our world-wide fight against Capitalist imperialism. It is clear, even at this early date that the cease-fire offer made through Comrade Malik has disconcerted our enemies, and it promises to achieve great psychological results. Let me place it in the scheme of our general strategy.

It is strange indeed that the Capitalist camp should be so intent upon discovering the secret of our strategy. Stalin has given its formula much publicity, long ago. He said that we must replace

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Capitalist encirclement of Socialism with Socialist encirclement of Capitalism. This means that we must work towards the progressive isolation of Capitalist strongholds. We must narrow down "the world" to which the Western group of countries has access, while we must also, within this Western group, tend to isolate the United States.

Stalin said, and proved, during the inter-war period that "Socialism in one country is possible". We shall see whether Capitalism can survive in a group of countries and finally in one. Indeed, before that is put to the test, the balance of forces will have swung so much in our favor that short-cuts may then be taken. For the moment, our business is to eat away parts of the pluto-democratic world. We have to liberate one country after another; the Capitalists call it "stealing".

This great game of snatching is to be played with the utmost caution. Our comrades in Czechoslovakia did admirably well. A parliamentary coalition put them in positions of power; from this vantage point, they proceeded to eliminate all elements of resistance, and to put reliable men in key positions. The ground was so well laid under unimpeachable parliamentary government that the day came when we could take over the Republic without encountering any resistance. This remains a model operation; but it cannot easily be repeated because in other countries non-Communist parties now shun association with us. Therefore, we are working up a new technique, which consists in eliminating Western influence through the agency of groups which have no connection with us, as in Iran. Nationalism is the passion we must work upon to pry countries away from the Western alliance.

It was necessary to bring up the Czechoslovak operation because it offers a direct contrast with the Korean operation. This latter to a certain extent went wrong. Hidebound by democratic forms, our opponents do not react energetically when they are attacked by a process which has the outward semblance of legality; they flare up only when violence is openly used. Thus in Korea there was armed reaction.

This of course we made good use of; we could show up American aggressiveness to Asian populations. No matter how the Americans came to be in Korea, or why, we were able to point out to Asian populations that here were Westerners fighting outside their territory, on Asian ground, against Asian soldiers, destroying Asian lives and homes. And this was good political education for the Asians.

But the Korean war had, on the other hand, very disturbing consequences. It aroused American concern with its lack of military force. Reverses irritated a proud nation, the lives given up by their soldiers induced a spirit of sacrifice. In short, the whole affair spurred the Americans to a great armament effort. We Communists are positivists: we do not deny the immense power of the American economic machine; indeed we envy it. Stalin has pointed to it as something to emulate. It is quite obvious to us that an American effort prosecuted with constancy would give the U.S. a great margin of material strength over the Soviet Union.

This would be very bad; even if things do not come to a general war, the forces which might eventually be thrown into the fray are a constant influence on the strategic conflict, and our having a margin of actual strength is very important to us. We know, even if the Western Europeans do not, that our evident influence upon them is due in great part to their relative military weakness; and also to their lack of confidence in a vast American hitting force immediately available. Therefore, a rapid growth of American military force is to our political disadvantage: it is to be prevented. The best way to prevent it is to lull American opinion to sleep.

Strangely enough, our interest in weakening the will to rearm is not understood by many American commentators. Quite a number of them think—an opinion we encourage by devious means—that our interest is to bring about an exhaustion of American economic forces, by forcing upon it an effort of preparedness. This is absurd: it stands to reason that an economy far more powerful than our own can, without exhaustion, produce a greater military instrument. This false opinion is, however, so firmly held that we find important American organs of opinion saying that we gained by having the U.S. embroiled in a fight and that we lose by the cease-fire.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If it were so we would, of course, not have proposed the cease-fire. What we stand to gain is the slackening of American effort.

Incidentally, we have at the very outset scored an enormous psychological victory over the unwitting Americans. The Americans seem to have regarded it as unimportant that the North Koreans would not come to talks in a place held by American forces, but insisted that negotiations should be held within the North Korean lines. One wonders at American innocence in this episode. Do not the Americans know that it is a standard practice for the vanquished to come for cease-fire negotiations to a place appointed by the winning side? "Enemy plenipotentiaries have requested admission into our lines" is a formula long held synonymous with capitulation. This is a very great psychological victory for the North Koreans; they can announce to their troops and to the population they inform that they have won a war—a war in which they were in fact very badly mauled!

I do not need to stress the aftermath of the cease-fire. The British Minister for Defense, M. Shinwell, stated in a public speech on the 1st of July, that "at the slightest sign the Government would be only too willing to curtail rearmament". There is no doubt at all that this represents the state of mind of Europeans and of a great number of Americans. The Western European press has fallen all over itself in its eagerness to present the inception of military talks as the road to "a general political settlement", a phrase full of appeal to the democratic press, but which we know to be quite empty of meaning. Therefore, we may conclude that, at no cost to us, we are achieving a real softening-up of the Western coalition.

Thus endeth the imaginary speech of the Communist briefer.

* * *

Dream Peace: In Europe the Soviet peace offensive has certainly scored a great success. The first faint gleam of sunshine brings out the appeasers in droves. Europeans, standing in dire peril, want to shake off the nightmare; they want to believe that this Stalinian imperialism, which calls for action on their part, is really just a misapprehension and that nothing need be done about it.

This writer has long been convinced, a) that the Western world as a whole is potentially far stronger than the Soviet Empire, and b) that Western Europe, after an interim period, could quite comfortably manage its own security. But even if the menace is, as I believe, relatively easy to cope with, it won't be coped with if one does not attend to it.

A striking feature of the European state of mind is an unwillingness or inability to concentrate on the vital issue. Today, with our very existence in jeopardy, we seem incapable of making our danger our main concern. When we look back on some similar attitude in the past, it seems to us fantastic. During the last legislature, a committee of the French Assembly investigated policy before the last war, and obloquy was cast upon the by-gone governments which had not addressed themselves to their most urgent duty. But the Third Force governments of the day repeated the same errors. They did not advance French rearmament, they worked against German rearmament, they impeded the integration of Spain in the Atlantic alliance. For these policies there were very good reasons. But there is a far better one for getting on with the job of European defence.

Failure to put first things first and to meet the situation squarely is sensed by many Europeans; there ensues a widespread tendency to blame existing political institutions. During his brutally enforced wartime meditation, Leon Blum wrote a valuable book *A l'Echelle Humaine,* in which he stressed the fact that parliamentary government had not stood up to the test of dangerous situations. This is often quoted. It is quite obvious that party politics played on ideological lines, as they are in Europe, tend to give undue weight to issues with which the parties have identified themselves, like nationalization for the Socialists; it is, moreover, plain that multi-party government, as practiced in France, tends to multiply the number of the party idols, and policy must take second place.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The formation of a coalition government in France today sets up as major problems those upon which the partners-to-be are in disagreement. Shall we reform the nationalized industries, as the Independents and Radicals demand, or give them a blank cheque upon the Budget, as the Socialists wish? Shall we help out the Catholic Schools as the M.R.P. and Independents demand, or shall they be starved till they come begging to be integrated in the State system, thus rounding out the State monopoly of education, dear to the Socialists and the Radicals? Shall we increase the Social Security allowance, as the Socialists and M.R.P. demand, and shall their emptied chests be replenished from the Treasury, against Radical and Independent protests? Patching such differences absorbs the whole energy of a Prime Minister: the capacity to find compromises is indeed the main qualification for Premiership.

All this is true and feeds an increasing demand for a strong government, a demand which even the heavy Gaullist vote fails to measure: by no means all who wish for a stronger government would trust it to the General. Personally, I wonder whether too much is not blamed upon the structure of political institutions, and too little upon the quality of the leaders. Not in France only, but in all European countries, there is a remarkable dearth of clear thinking, plain speaking, and forceful initiating of movement. The Europeans increasingly resent American leadership in the West: they attribute it to greater wealth and economic power; in my opinion it is due in part to a greater capacity for making decisions. However confused the Americans feel themselves to be and however fumbling they regard their policy, there is more reason and will there than in European policy. The failure of Europe to generate any adequate leadership is the most ominous feature of its bill of health.

* * *

European Overseas Interests: American opinion will have to make up its mind about European overseas interests. Are the political and economic interests of European States in Asia and Africa an evil survival of evil policies, or are they vital interests which the U.S. should take seriously and help to uphold?

It is relevant to the issue to compare the territorial expansion of the U.S. with the colonial expansion of Europe. The nascent American Republic found at its doors great open spaces rife with natural resources, and expanded without difficulty. Russia enjoyed an untrammeled expansion eastward, quite similar to the westward expansion of the U.S. The European States were far less fortunate; each of them came up against other powers and none could find more territory or more natural resources by progress inland; expansion overseas was a substitute.

To take only a minor aspect of the importance of overseas interests to European States, the loss of these sources of raw materials would mean a much worsened balance of payments and a much increased dependence upon American bounty. Consider what the replacement of Iranian oil by American oil means dollar-wise.

It is perhaps in order to note that the countries which have successively fallen under Soviet influence have successively ceased to provide Europe with primary products. To take an outstanding example, Russian wheat arriving at Antwerp and Rotterdam during the 19th Century and up to World War I helped to make up the Western European shortage: this stopped altogether after the Bolshevik revolution. Danubian exports of primary products were not resumed after World War II. The same will be true of Iranian oil, of Malayan rubber and so forth.

This is a great problem for Europe, and no easy solution springs to mind. It seems a bit simple to merely hail the end of Colonialism.

Last month we instituted the use of roman type, instead of typewriter type, for this EUROPEAN SUPPLEMENT, *and we asked our readers for expressions of preference. The vote was about 50-50. So, the plebisicite continues. Please write us.*

1710 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED